as to include even those attending to election duties that has provided appellants with a basis for arguing that the provisions operate in an invidiously discriminatory fashion to deny them a more convenient method of exercising the franchise. Indeed, appellants' challenge seems to disclose not an arbitrary scheme or plan but, rather, the very opposite—a consistent and laudable state policy of adding, over a 50-year period, groups to the absentee coverage as their existence comes to the attention of the legislature. That Illinois has not gone still further, as perhaps it might, should not render void its remedial legislation, which need not, as we have stated before, "strike at all evils at the same time." *Semler* v. *Dental Examiners*, 294 U. S. 608, 610 (1935).

Accordingly, the judgment of the District Court is

Affirmed.

MR. JUSTICE HARLAN and MR. JUSTICE STEWART concur in the result.

---

provision for inaccessibility of polls, Alaska Laws, Tit. 15, § 15.20.010 (1962), Cal. Election Code § 14620 (1961), Oregon Rev. Stat. §§ 253.010 (a), 253.510 (1968). Maine appears to be the only State to allow the absentee ballot for absence from the polls for any "sufficient" reason, Maine Rev. Stat. Ann., Tit. 21, §§ 1251, 1306 (1964).

On the other hand, all States make provisions for the Armed Forces, either expressly or impliedly. All but five States have extended the ballot to the physically disabled; and only six require absence from the State, rather than county or precinct, as a condition. See appellee's survey of state laws, attached to its brief on appeal.